

An aerial photograph of a coastal area, likely the Presidio of San Francisco, showing a mix of green hills, urban development, and a body of water in the background. The image is faded and serves as a background for the text.

Final Environmental Impact Statement

Presidio Trust Management Plan

Land Use Policies for Area B of the Presidio of San Francisco

Volume III Appendices

MAY 2002

PRESIDIO TRUST MANAGEMENT PLAN (PTMP): LAND USE POLICIES FOR AREA B OF THE PRESIDIO OF SAN FRANCISCO FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

San Francisco, California

The Presidio Trust Management Plan (PTMP) Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is comprised of three volumes, each bound under separate cover: the EIS (Volume I), Responses to Comments (Volume II), and the Appendices (Volume III). This is Volume III (see below for contents of all three volumes). The Presidio Trust is the Lead Agency and project proponent. This Final EIS and corresponding Final Plan (PTMP) represent the culmination of a two-year public planning and environmental review process.

This Final EIS describes and analyzes alternatives to update the General Management Plan Amendment (GMPA) adopted in 1994 by the National Park Service (NPS) for the area of the Presidio of San Francisco now under the jurisdiction of the Presidio Trust (Area B). The proposed action (Final Plan) and five additional alternatives have been assessed along with a variant of the Final Plan Alternative developed in response to public comment on the Draft Plan and Draft EIS.

Under the 1996 Trust Act, as amended, Congress created the Trust to preserve and enhance the cultural, natural, scenic, and recreational resources of the Presidio for public use while ensuring that the park becomes financially self-sufficient with respect to both annual operations and long-term needs. Each of the alternatives presented in this EIS achieves this differently and has a

different emphasis. Principal differences include the proposed total building square footage, the proposed amount of non-residential and residential uses, the amount of open space and the method of delivery of public programs. The maximum overall square footage of 5,960,000 allowed under the Trust Act would not be exceeded under any alternative.

Major impact topics assessed in this EIS include historic resources, cultural landscape, archaeology, biological resources, water resources, visual resources, air quality, noise, land use, socioeconomic issues, visitor experience, recreation, public safety, transportation, water supply, utilities, and Trust operations. Mitigation measures are included to reduce impacts identified in many of these topic areas.

No decision on the Final Plan will be made or recorded until at least 30 days after the publication of notice by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) in the Federal Register that this Final EIS has been filed with the EPA. For further information about this document or the NEPA process, please contact the Trust in writing at 34 Graham Street, San Francisco, CA 94129 or by telephone at 415/561-5300. Copies of all three volumes of the Final EIS and the Final Plan are available at the Trust Library (34 Graham Street), on the Trust website at www.presidiotrust.gov and in local libraries.

VOLUME I: ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

- Cover Sheet
- Introduction
- Table of Contents
- Summary
- Chapter 1: Purpose and Need
- Chapter 2: Alternatives
- Chapter 3: Affected Environment
- Chapter 4: Environmental Consequences and Mitigation
- Chapter 5: Consultation and Coordination
- Chapter 6: References
- Chapter 7: List of Acronyms
- Chapter 8: Glossary
- Chapter 9: Index

VOLUME II: RESPONSES TO COMMENTS

- Cover Sheet
- Table of Contents
- Chapter 1: Introduction
- Chapter 2: Methodology and Organization
- Chapter 3: Comment Origins and Commentor Characteristics
- Chapter 4: Responses to Comments
- Chapter 5: Public Agency Comments
- Chapter 6: Directory of Responses to Comments

VOLUME III: APPENDICES

- Cover Sheet
- Introduction
- Table of Contents
- Appendix A: Environmental Screening Form
- Appendix B: Final Plan Planning Principles and District Guidelines
- Appendix C: Contributing Features of the NHL
- Appendix D: Final Programmatic Agreement
- Appendix E: Socioeconomic/Housing Supply
- Appendix F: Schools
- Appendix G: Transportation
- Appendix H: Water
- Appendix I: Solid Waste
- Appendix J: Energy
- Appendix K: Financial Analysis

1. INTRODUCTION

This is Volume III of the Final Environmental Impact Statement (Final EIS) regarding the proposed management plan for areas of the Presidio of San Francisco (Presidio) under Presidio Trust (Trust) jurisdiction. The Final EIS supplements the Final General Management Plan Amendment Environmental Impact Statement (GMFA EIS) adopted in 1994 by the National Park Service (NPS) for the Presidio. The Final EIS is prepared in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), the Council on Environmental Quality's (CEQ) implementing regulations at 40 CFR Parts 1500-1508, and the Trust's own supplemental implementing regulations in 36 CFR Part 1010. Volume I is the EIS text. Volume II contains a summary of the public and agency comments received on the Draft EIS, along with written responses to those comments. Volume III contains technical appendices related to and supplementing the Final EIS analyses in Volume I.

The Draft Presidio Trust Implementation Plan (Draft Plan or PTIP) and Draft EIS were circulated for public and agency review from July 25, 2001 to October 25, 2001, a period of 90 days. During this period, the Trust received over 3,000 comment letters, as well as oral comments provided at two public hearings, and at a public meeting of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Citizens' Advisory Commission. Original comment letters and transcripts are available for review at the Presidio Trust library, 34 Graham Street, in the Presidio.

The Trust carefully considered public comments, and made modifications to the text of the Draft Plan and Draft EIS as a result of those comments. Modifications included re-naming and revising elements of the Draft Plan, inclusion of a variant of that plan in the Final EIS and other modest adjustments to the text and analysis of the Final EIS. These changes are summarized in this introduction and explained further within the responses to comments included in Volume II of the Final EIS.

Following distribution of the Final EIS, and following the 30-day "no action" period required under NEPA, the Trust Board of Directors will consider adoption of a final plan. The Board's action could include, but is not limited to, adoption of the preferred alternative (the Final Plan), rejection of all

alternatives, and/or partial or conditional approval of a particular alternative. The Board's action, through a Record of Decision, will describe the scope and basis of the decision, the mitigations or conditions upon which it is contingent, and how the Final EIS will be used in subsequent decision making.

What follows is a summary of changes to the Plan itself (Section 1.1), followed by a summary of changes made in the Final EIS in response to public and agency comments on the Draft EIS (Section 1.2).

1.1 CHANGES TO THE PLAN

In response to public input, the Trust's preferred plan (Final Plan or Plan) has been renamed and reorganized. Now titled The Presidio Trust Management Plan: Land Use Policies for Area B of the Presidio of San Francisco, the revised document more clearly articulates its intended role as a general planning or policy framework that will be used to guide future, more specific planning and implementation decisions. Two salient facts must be borne in mind in reviewing and evaluating the Final Plan: (1) it will reduce development – shown as the square footage of buildings – to significantly less than the status quo; and (2) it will increase open space to substantially more than the status quo. Thus, the Final Plan removes development rather than fostering it. Changes in the Final Plan are summarized below.

1.1.1 VISION AND PLAN ORGANIZATION

The Final Plan document has been reorganized and many sections rewritten to provide greater clarity. Preservation of the Presidio's cultural, natural, scenic and recreational resources for public use is articulated clearly as the cornerstone of the Plan, and therefore its "vision." The preface, vision statement, summary, and introduction section of the Draft Plan have been combined and shortened into the "Overview" of the Final Plan.

Planning principles presented in Chapter 2 of the Draft Plan have been retained in what is now Chapter One of the Final Plan, or included within the land use, transportation, and infrastructure discussions in Chapter Two. The discussion of park programs originally presented in Chapter 3 of the Draft

1.1.4 BUILT SPACE AND NEW CONSTRUCTION

The Final Plan's square footage reduction goal has been revised to be a commitment to reduce existing built space from 5.96 million square feet to 5.6 million square feet or less over time. The role of new construction was also clarified in the Final Plan to state that non-residential construction would be primarily used to facilitate the effective rehabilitation and reuse of historic buildings, with limited additional replacement construction to be used to meet other Plan goals.

1.1.5 CULTURAL AND EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS

The Trust's commitment to high quality programming for park visitors remains in place, and is articulated in Chapter One of the Final Plan. Chapter Two of the Final Plan breaks out the discussion of cultural programs from educational uses to provide greater specifics than were available in the Draft Plan regarding the use of building space for public uses. Clarification is also provided regarding the delivery of programs. The Plan's goal is to facilitate delivery of high quality programs by the NPS, the Trust, tenants, and other partners with expertise in program delivery. In response to comments, the Draft Plan's assumption of \$10 million annually to park programming has been reduced to a more modest goal (\$2 million, increasing to \$5 million over time), and the related goal of attracting funding for programs from philanthropic and other outside sources is clearly articulated.

1.1.6 FUTURE PLANNING AND DECISION MAKING

In response to general confusion expressed in comments regarding the role of additional planning and public input in future Trust decisions, the Final Plan clarifies these issues. Chapter Four of the Final Plan summarizes previous and ongoing implementation actions, and provides specific examples regarding the near-term planning and implementation activities that the Trust expects to undertake once the Final Plan is adopted. Because implementation activities that will be undertaken many years from now cannot be described in any detail, a generalized implementation timeline is provided, along with a discussion of overall priorities and strategy.

Before many future implementation activities are undertaken, they will often involve additional planning, environmental analysis, and public input. The nature of additional process is identified for specific classes of activities. For example, the Final Plan specifies that all new construction – beyond minor building additions – will require public input and agency consultation pursuant to NEPA and the NHPA, and summarizes what that will involve.

1.2 CHANGES TO THE EIS

In response to public comment and changes made to the Final Plan, the Final EIS was also revised as summarized below.

1.2.1 ALTERNATIVES

The Final Plan alternative has been modified to reflect changes from the Draft Plan, including the reallocation of some potential new building square footage from Crissy Field (Area B) to the Letterman district, and the re-designation of certain areas for restoration as native plant communities in the South Hills district. Land use assumptions have also been revised to reflect the potential location of infrastructure (e.g., a recycled water plant) in the Letterman district, and the potential location of Golden Gate Bridge maintenance facilities in the Fort Scott district.

At the request of commentors who suggested that a variety of new alternatives be analyzed, the responses to comments clarify the spectrum of alternatives captured within the range included in the Draft EIS, and the Final EIS incorporates a variant to the Final Plan Alternative. Designed to be as consistent as possible with a detailed Sierra Club proposal, the Final Plan Variant is more aggressive than the Final Plan Alternative with respect to building demolition, emphasizes the replacement of removed housing units within existing buildings, and provides for no new construction (i.e., none of the removed building space can be replaced).

A few land use assumptions associated with the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000) have been corrected to reflect cultural/educational rather than office use of about 220,000 square feet in the Main Post planning district, reflecting the 1994 GMPA's identification of the Montgomery Street Barracks as the location of these kinds of uses.

VOLUME III: APPENDICES

1. Introduction

The land use assumptions tables in the financial analysis have also been clarified. One table now summarizes land use assumptions for each planning district in every alternative. These assumptions are also presented in the environmental consequences (land use) section of the EIS, and form the basis of all EIS impact analyses. Another table summarizes the amount of potential new construction assumed in each planning district in each alternative. The data for the Final Plan Alternative are consistent with quantitative limits set forth in the Plan document, and represents the maximum potential rather than proposed amount of new construction. Finally, the table summarizing the residential program for all alternatives has been revised to clarify assumptions regarding the number of units removed (whether through demolition or conversion) and the number replaced (whether within existing buildings or new construction). The housing goals in the Final Plan fall within the assumptions previously embedded in the Draft EIS analysis and carried forward in the Final EIS.

Presidio Trust Management Plan Final EIS

Volume III: Appendices

Table of Contents

Introduction	1-1
A. Revised Environmental Screening Form	A-1
B. Final Plan Planning Principles and District Guidelines	B-1
C. Contributing Features of the NHLD	C-1
D. Final Programmatic Agreement	D-1
E. Socioeconomic/Housing Supply	E-1
F. Schools	F-1
G. Transportation	G-1
H. Water	H-1
I. Solid Waste	I-1
J. Energy	J-1
K. Financial Analysis	K-1

APPENDIX A
Revised Environmental Screening Form

NEPA ENVIRONMENTAL SCREENING FORM

REVISED NEPA ENVIRONMENTAL SCREENING FORM

1. Background

- *Project Title* -- Presidio Trust Management Plan
- *Agency* -- The Presidio Trust, 34 Graham Street, P.O. Box 29052, San Francisco, CA 94129-0052
- *Project* -- A comprehensive planning effort to update the July 1994 Final General Management Plan Amendment for Area B of the Presidio of San Francisco (Presidio Trust Management Plan or PTMP).
- *Contact Person* -- John Pelka, NEPA Compliance Manager
- *Phone Number* -- (415) 561-5300

2. Project Description

The Presidio Trust is proposing to update portions of the 1994 Presidio General Management Plan Amendment (GMPA) completed by the National Park Service (NPS) in 1994. The proposed update is for the areas of the Presidio of San Francisco that were transferred to the Trust's jurisdiction (Area B) by Congress under the 1996 Presidio Trust Act (Trust Act). This Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is accompanied by a Final Plan document entitled Presidio Trust Management Plan; Land Use Policies for Area B of the Presidio of San Francisco (PTMP). Together these documents supplement the 1994 GMPA and GMPA EIS. The Plan update and supplemental EIS are necessary to reflect the 1998 change in administrative jurisdiction of Area B and other substantive changes occurring since 1994, as is explained in the EIS.

3. Purpose of Environmental Screening Form and Supplemental EIS

The ESF is based on the results of a preliminary environmental analysis and early public scoping for the project. This Environmental Screening Form (ESF) is being used to de-emphasize insignificant issues, and narrow the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Plan accordingly. The PTMP EIS will supplement the GMPA Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) (National Park Service 1994a)¹. The GMPA EIS is a program document that analyzed the environmental consequences of four alternatives for management and use of the Presidio, and identified mitigation measures to avoid or reduce adverse effects. The PTMP EIS will concentrate on new information relevant to environmental concerns that bear on the PTMP alternatives or their impacts. These issues include substantial changes that have occurred with respect to the circumstances under which the GMPA was prepared. NEPA Regulations encourage this approach to "focus on the issues which are ripe for decision and exclude from consideration issues already decided or not yet ripe" (Section 1508.28). After PTMP is complete and adopted by the Trust, additional site-specific plans and environmental analyses, as appropriate, will be prepared to fully implement the programmatic goals of the Plan.

¹ The Presidio GMPA EIS can be viewed at: the Presidio Trust, 34 Graham Street, San Francisco, California; Park Headquarters, Building 201, Fort Mason, San Francisco, California; or at the San Francisco Main Library, Government Information Center, Larkin and Grove Streets, San Francisco, California.

NEPA ENVIRONMENTAL SCREENING FORM

ARE ANY MEASURABLE EFFECTS POSSIBLE ON THE FOLLOWING IMPACT TOPICS THAT WERE DISCUSSED IN THE GMPA EIS DUE TO CHANGED CIRCUMSTANCES OR NEW OPPORTUNITIES SINCE PREPARATION OF THE GMPA?

Yes No

- | | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 23. Recreation and Public Access? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 24. Scenic Viewing? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 25. Human Health, Safety, and the Environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 26. Energy Consumption? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 27. Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 28. Other Significant Environmental Resources? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

5. Preliminary Evaluation of Impacts

1. *Regional Economy and Employment?* YES. Land uses that differ from those specified in the GMPA, as well as increases in the numbers of visitors to the park, could have effects on the city and region. Construction and renovation activities would also contribute to the local and regional economy. The EIS will discuss the potential impact of the proposed action on the economy and employment in the Bay Area and the City of San Francisco.
2. *City Services?* YES. The EIS will discuss the potential impact due to additional requirements that the proposed action may place on city services, including utility systems, transportation services, the public school system, and public safety services.
3. *Solid Waste?* YES. The EIS will discuss the increased generation of solid waste, and effects on its landfills.
4. *Health Care?* NO. The effects of alternative uses of the Letterman Army Medical Center and Letterman Army Institute of Research were adequately addressed in the final Letterman Complex EIS. The increase, if any, in number of medical aid incidents requiring hospitalization due to the proposed alternatives would be distributed among area hospitals and would not impact area hospital services. Therefore, additional study under the EIS is not warranted.
5. *Housing?* YES. The EIS will discuss the potential impact on regional demand for housing units due to changes in Presidio employee housing demand, housing removals or conversions, and potential new construction.
6. *Traffic and Transportation Systems?* YES. The EIS will discuss the potential impact of alternative modes of travel, increased traffic, parking changes, demand for transit, and roadway improvements on Presidio (Areas A and B) traffic, roadways, and parking and on the local and regional transportation network due to the proposed action. New information, to the extent known, on the effect of proposed Doyle Drive reconstruction on Presidio traffic will also be provided.



17. *Geology and Soils?* NO. Information on topographic conditions, geologic hazards, and soils within the Presidio is provided on pages 102 and 103 in the GMPA EIS and is incorporated by reference and summarized in this document. The Presidio consists of a blanket of unconsolidated sediments (dune and beach sand, landslide debris, alluvium, artificial fill) overlying bedrock (mostly Franciscan mélange) which is exposed on cliffs and hills. Ground surface elevations range from sea level to about +1300 feet above mean sea level. The two major active faults near the Presidio are the San Andreas (about 9 kilometers west) and the Hayward (about 16 kilometers east) Strong earthquake shaking is highly likely to result from earthquakes on the San Andreas or Hayward faults, or other more distant faults in the San Francisco Bay Area.² Landslides are a major topographic hazard in the Presidio because of steep, hilly terrain and unstable sediments or weak bedrock formations. Prolonged rainfall, earthquakes, or continuous disturbance of the original terrain can trigger landslides. Soils in the Presidio are mostly excessively drained sands, artificial fill, and other Urban Land (asphalt, concrete, etc.), all of which are subject to seismic ground shaking hazards to some degree. Portions of the Main Post, Letterman Complex, and Crissy Field are located in a zone potentially subject to liquefaction during strong earthquake shaking. Future earthquake shaking may be exacerbated and damage intensified within these areas because the soft liquefiable sands may lose strength rapidly.
18. *Site-specific development projects implementing the Plan will require supplemental review to evaluate geologic and seismic hazards and to comply with the Seismic Hazard Mapping Act. The Trust will refer to the State of California's Seismic Hazard Zones map of the county (California Division of Mines and Geology 2000) and utilize Guidelines for Evaluating and Mitigating Seismic Hazards in California (California Division of Mines and Geology 1997) in developing mitigation design. Mitigation evaluations and preparation of mitigation designs will be performed by a California Certified Engineering Geologist and/or a Registered Geotechnical Engineer (to evaluate geologic subgrade, earthquake ground motion, and liquefaction), and/or Registered Structural Engineer (to evaluate structural safety), as appropriate. Because site-specific recommendations for the mitigation of geologic hazards will be incorporated into subsequent NEPA documents, more study at this program level of environmental review is not warranted.*
19. *Floodplains.* NO. This impact topic was dismissed from further consideration in the GMPA EIS. Crissy Field is the only area within the Presidio that was historically subjected to minor recurrent flooding due to an inadequate local drainage system. Since preparation of the GMPA EIS, the Trust has installed \$1.2 million of new storm drain improvements and a new stormwater outfall. These improvements have reduced the risk of flooding in the Crissy Field area. However, Crissy Field may be at risk from future tsunamis (seismic sea waves, also known as tidal waves) created by earthquakes or other disturbances in the Pacific Ocean.³ Should it be determined that a specific development project within Crissy Field/Area B would result in an unacceptable risk of flood loss and human safety based on the best information available during subsequent environmental review, the Presidio Trust would consider practicable alternatives or not construct the new structures and facilities within this area. In such cases, design will be governed by consideration of probabilistic estimates of the risk of damage resulting from tsunamis or other natural

² The California Division of Mines and Geology has calculated the ground motion using probabilistic seismic hazard methods as outlined in the joint Division and U.S. Geological Survey report, Division Open-File Report 96-08. For the Design Basis Earthquake (i.e., 10 percent chance of exceedance in 50 years), ground motion is calculated to be Peak Ground Acceleration (PGA) = 0.67g. A value over 0.65g is considered "violent shaking," with the potential for "heavy" damage to structures.

³ According to the GMPA EIS, 19 tsunamis were reported at the Golden Gate between 1868 and 1968. The maximum tsunami was reported to be 7.4 feet. A tsunami of 7.9 feet occurs about once every 100 years.



NEPA ENVIRONMENTAL SCREENING FORM

The Trust's cleanup of non-petroleum substances, pollutants, and contaminants on the Presidio is addressed through compliance with pollution cleanup laws that include environmental data collection, analyses, remedial design and implementation, and reporting and documentation requirements, separate from the PTMP and its associated NEPA process. The data collection, analyses, and cleanup efforts are being managed in accordance with federal Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA) and through regulations set forth in Title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR). Cleanup of petroleum contamination is governed by Title 23 of the California Code of Regulations (CCR), California Health and Safety Code Chapters 6.5 and 6.8, and the National Oil and Hazardous Substances Contingency Plan (Title 40 CFR, Part 300). The overall cleanup of the Presidio is regulated by the State of California and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). Within the State, the California EPA (Cal-EPA) Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) has oversight authority and jurisdiction over the non-petroleum CERCLA sites and locations subject to Health and Safety Code requirements. DTSC consults with EPA as necessary. The Cal-EPA Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) is the lead on the cleanup of petroleum-contaminated sites ("Petroleum Program").

Formal mechanisms for implementing the cleanup consist of regulatory orders and memoranda of agreement (MOA). DTSC governs the cleanup of non-petroleum sites based on a Consent Agreement signed by the Trust and DTSC in August 1999 ("CERCLA Program"). The RWQCB issued Order No. 96-070, which covers petroleum cleanup activities. There are also two MOAs -- Army, Trust, and NPS (MOA), and the Trust and NPS (Area A MOA). These MOA were finalized in May 1999 and identify the results of negotiations with the Army to complete the Main Installation investigation and to assume the lead for the cleanup. Both MOAs direct expedited cleanup and reuse of the Presidio while ensuring protection of human health and the environment.

Following passage of the Base Realignment and Conversion (BRAC) legislation in 1994, responsibility for cleanup of hazardous waste sites shifted from the U.S. Army to the Presidio. Along with the transfer of lead agency status to the Presidio Trust, the Army agreed to provide \$100 million to be dispersed over four years to pay for the cleanup efforts. Under this agreement (by the Presidio Trust, NPS and the U.S. Army), the Trust will continue the Army's cleanup program and accelerate the schedule from a 30-year to a 10-year schedule.

Although the Presidio is not on the National Priorities List (Superfund), the cleanup is following the CERCLA cleanup process, which consists of:

- = A Remedial Investigation (RI) Report, which summarizes the nature and extent of contamination, as determined by investigation overseen by DTSC. The RI incorporates risk assessment information based on existing and proposed land uses;
- = A Feasibility Study (FS), which identifies remedial objectives, evaluates the feasibility of various remedial technologies, and develops remedial alternatives to address the remedial objectives identified for the site. A Draft and Final FS is prepared. The Draft is made available for public review and comment, in addition to soliciting input from regulatory agencies;



NEPA ENVIRONMENTAL SCREENING FORM

A Presidio-wide Contingency Plan (under development) covers unknown contamination that may be discovered at other areas of the Presidio during construction, demolition, or other development activities. This plan documents presumptive remedies for contamination that may be discovered and includes procedures for handling hazardous materials, stained soil, etc., and contact procedures for notifying the agencies and the public.

Public comment on the remediation goals and activities is addressed through the cleanup process itself rather than through this NEPA process. Under CERCLA, public comments received on the Draft FS and Draft RAP documents must be considered in the preparation of the Final RI/FS and Final RAP. The Trust has also prepared a Community Relations Plan in accordance with DTSC guidance and CERCLA requirements. It was released in January 2001 as a draft and, following receipt and incorporation of comments, will become final. Reports of the site investigation and remediation studies performed at the Presidio can be reviewed at the information repositories maintained at the Trust's library, 34 Graham Street, or at the library on the second floor of 1750 Lincoln Boulevard. Review copies of the Draft FS and Draft RAP will also be available at 34 Graham Street and 1750 Lincoln Boulevard. Individuals who wish to be notified of the release of these documents should contact Jane Packer, the Trust's Community Relations Specialist (415/561-4255).

Another opportunity for public comment on the cleanup is provided through the site Restoration Advisory Board (RAB). As part of the BRAC process, the RAB was established in 1994 and routinely consults with the Presidio Trust, state agencies and the National Park Service (NPS) regarding cleanup of the Presidio. The RAB meets twice per month; every 2nd Tuesday is the official RAB meeting that is open to the public, agencies, the Trust and NPS, and other entities.

Therefore, potential impacts to human health, safety, and the environment following cleanup and implementation of the PTMP are not anticipated to be significant, and more study under the EIS is not warranted.

26. *Energy Consumption?* YES. The GMPA EIS determined that energy-reducing measures at the Presidio would have a minor but positive effect on energy conservation in the region. The Presidio Trust implements cost effective and aggressive energy efficiency practices and sustainable design principles in Trust and tenant facilities to significantly reduce energy consumption in accordance with Executive Order 13123 – Greening The Government Through Efficient Energy Management and its Green Building Guidelines (Presidio Trust 2000e). Energy consumption (per gross square foot) at the Presidio will be reduced through life cycle cost effective measures by at least 35 percent by 2010 relative to 1985. In addition, energy conservation standards required by the State of California's Title 24 building standards for energy using systems at Presidio buildings (that do not impact building historical architectural features) will be met or exceeded by 10 percent in 2002 and 25 percent in 2005. However, while the Trust will make best efforts to comply with efficient energy management goals, because energy requirements and conservation potential of the proposed alternatives may be greater than that covered under the GMPA EIS, additional analysis under the EIS is required.

27. *Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations?* YES. Executive Order 12898 – Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations directs federal agencies to assess whether



N E P A E N V I R O N M E N T A L S C R E E N I N G F O R M

- 2000d *Financial Concepts Workshop, September 13, 2000. 4 pages.*
- 2000e *Green Building Guidelines for the Rehabilitation of Historic and Non-Historic Buildings. Draft Report. Dated October 5, 2000.*
- 2001 *Draft Presidio Trust Implementation Plan.*

Reference: 36 CFR Part 1010.

Dated: April 25, 2002.



APPENDIX B

Presidio Trust Management Plan – Planning Principles and District Guidelines

APPENDIX B

Presidio Trust Management Plan – Planning Principles and District Guidelines

PRESIDIO TRUST MANAGEMENT PLAN – PLANNING PRINCIPLES

1. Protect the historic character and integrity of the National Historic Landmark District while allowing changes that will maintain the site's vitality. Rehabilitate historic buildings compatibly for adaptive and feasible uses. Protect the Presidio's cultural landscape.
2. Evaluate for possible demolition or replacement structures that may not be cost-effectively rehabilitated or reused. Limit any replacement construction to areas of existing development. Ensure that the design and location of replacement construction are in keeping with the character and integrity of the National Historic Landmark District.
3. Rehabilitate the historic planted forest, and preserve, enhance, and manage other forested areas that provide values such as windbreaks, vistas, screening, and wildlife habitat.
4. Protect archeological resources for future research and interpretation.
5. Preserve significant Presidio collections and existing significant objects in the landscape.
6. Identify, protect, enhance, restore, and expand the Presidio's ecosystems. Protect, establish, and manage areas of native vegetation.
7. Identify, monitor, and protect sensitive wildlife species, and restore and maintain their habitats.
8. Rehabilitate and enhance natural water resources. Manage on-site water resources to protect ground and surface water, natural wetland and riparian habitat, and water supplies for the Presidio community. Protect important native geologic and soil components.
9. Increase open space areas to enhance the park and improve the Presidio's natural, scenic, and recreational qualities. Enhance the Presidio's spectacular views and vistas. Maintain the Presidio's ecological value, and the intrinsic values to the human senses and human health offered by its air quality, light, sound, and aromas.
10. Provide for safe and enjoyable recreational use of the Presidio. Improve larger open spaces for outdoor activities and play. Enhance existing recreation facilities, add play opportunities, and complement outdoor areas. Ensure a seamless network of trails and bikeways through the Presidio.
11. Collaborate with the National Park Service and other organizations to interpret the stories of the Presidio, contributing to the preservation of the park by deepening the public's understanding of the park's resources and history.
12. Build public commitment to preserving the Presidio's natural, historic, cultural, scenic, and recreational resources by developing hands-on educational opportunities for visitors and volunteers.
13. By providing appropriate park programs and increasing public access, create the conditions for a diverse and thriving community of residents, tenants, and organizations who contribute to the park in different ways.
14. Perpetuate Presidio traditions and encourage visitors to participate in events and ceremonies. Provide settings for the arts and for historical and cultural programs.
15. Provide visitor orientation and consistent signage, and make access as universal as possible.

DISTRICT GUIDELINES

MAIN POST

Guideline for Spatial Organization and Land Patterns

- Maintain the Main Post as the "heart of the Presidio" through rehabilitation, reuse, and interpretation of historic buildings, open spaces, and archeological resources. Consider selective placement of compatibly-

APPENDIX B

Presidio Trust Management Plan – Planning Principles and District Guidelines

CRISSY FIELD

Guideline for Spatial Organization and Land Patterns

- Preserve the historic line of buildings along Mason Street at the east and west ends. Reinforce the context of the historic airfield. Reinforce the southern Mason Street edge, in areas set apart from the historic clusters, through modifications or replacement of existing non-historic buildings or other site improvements. Protect and restore remnant natural systems (including coastal bluffs) to the greatest extent possible.

Guidelines for Buildings and Structures

- Rehabilitate historic building clusters and their landscapes to re-activate the Mason Street edge along the historic airfield.
- Ensure that new buildings or building additions are compatible with adjacent historic buildings in scale, massing, and materials, and that their design integrates the historic relationship of indoor and outdoor spaces.
- Site any new buildings or building additions in a manner that respects historic Mason Street and other aspects of the historic context.
- Protect steep bluff slopes. Preserve views to and from the bluffs and Main Post by keeping the height of any new buildings or building additions below the bluff profile (30 to 45 feet).
- In the siting of new buildings and site improvements, consider and assess effects on both known and as-yet unknown archeological sites at Crissy Field (Area B).

Guidelines for Open Space/Vegetation/Views

- Create safe and inviting open space connections between Crissy Field (Area B) and other parts of the park (i.e., Main Post, Letterman, and Fort Scott).

- Preserve Mason Street as an open streetscape with expansive views. Retain the "open" setting and feel of Crissy Field; limit the introduction of vast, new landscape plantings.
- Explore options for open space connections between the Main Parade Ground at the Main Post and central Crissy Field (Area B) as part of Doyle Drive's reconstruction.
- Reconstruct Doyle Drive to preserve views to and from the bluffs and Main Post, and maximize views along Halleck Street, Tennessee Hollow, and from the Cavalry Stables.
- Preserve the hollow at McDowell Avenue (where the Cavalry Stables are located) as a grassy, open clearing surrounded by forested steep slopes.
- Protect and restore the ecological communities on the western bluffs.

Guidelines for Circulation and Access

- Maintain historic Mason Street as the primary east-west circulation spine at Crissy Field (Area B) and enhance pedestrian and bike access.
- Enhance pedestrian connections to the Main Post, the Letterman complex, and the Cavalry Stables.
- Enhance access with transit links to the rest of the Presidio and the city.
- Consider establishing new parking areas for Crissy Field and Main Post visitors in locations that are unobtrusive yet readily accessible to activity areas.

LETTERMAN

Guideline for Spatial Organization and Land Pattern

- Re-establish the active character of the historic hospital district by rehabilitating the Thornburgh Road/Gorgas Avenue buildings and restoring key open spaces. Consider compatible infill construction to

APPENDIX B

Presidio Trust Management Plan – Planning Principles and District Guidelines

FORT SCOTT

Guideline for Spatial Organization and Land Patterns

- Protect and enhance Fort Scott's historic ensemble of buildings and landscapes. New uses should be compatible with the retreat-like character of Fort Scott.

Guidelines for Buildings and Structures

- Rehabilitate historic buildings at Fort Scott and maintain the integrity of existing historic clusters.
- Allow infill construction only areas that are well removed from the historic parade ground. Avoid any construction that would adversely affect the surrounding historic forest, an important part of Fort Scott's visual setting.
- Minimize disturbance of existing grades, avoid impacts on important views from the historic core, and ensure that new construction responds to the general scale and character of the district's buildings. Maximum building height should be between 30 feet to 45 feet.

Guidelines for Open Space/Vegetation/Views

- Restore the parade ground to its original configuration and re-establish it as the district's main gathering place.
- Relocate the ball fields at the northern end of the parade ground and restore the historic parade ground to a gently sloping lawn.
- Preserve and rehabilitate significant historic landscape features, including the formal landscape adjacent to Wool Court.
- Maintain and enhance low trees and shrubs to provide a buffer against Doyle Drive.

- Selectively remove non-historic trees and landscape features, consistent with the *Vegetation Management Plan*, to re-establish views and Fort Scott's historic visual connection to the Golden Gate, San Francisco Bay, and the coast.
- Restore natural resources along Dragonfly Creek, as well as wetland and rare plant habitat northeast of the Fort Scott parade ground.

Guidelines for Circulation and Access

- Clarify and simplify vehicular, bicycle, and pedestrian access to create clear and safe traffic patterns at Fort Scott. Maintain low-key access with primary emphasis on pedestrians and bicycles.
- Establish safe, clear, and distinct access from Lincoln Boulevard into the district.
- Provide pedestrian connections to adjacent residential clusters, including North Fort Scott, and to coastal areas. Provide safe pedestrian and bicycle access to the Golden Gate Bridge.
- Where possible, limit parking to smaller lots at the periphery of the built areas of Fort Scott.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE HOSPITAL DISTRICT: RESIDENTIAL AND EDUCATIONAL COMMUNITY

Guidelines for Spatial Organization and Land Patterns

- Maintain the historic patterns of development, primarily on the lower plateau. The formal placement of buildings around open spaces and the definition of open space and streets through plantings should be retained. Infill construction should respect historic spatial relationships, scale, and orientation of buildings.
- Enhance open space and preserve natural processes for a functioning ecological system on the upper plateau below the Nike Missile site.

APPENDIX B

Presidio Trust Management Plan – Planning Principles and District Guidelines

- Ensure that any replacement housing reinforces and complements existing street patterns and conforms to existing contours, with no major regrading or leveling.
- Ensure that any replacement housing is responsive to existing historic typologies. Garages and outbuildings, if included, should be located at the back of buildings, with access from existing alleys, where possible.
- For building additions and replacement housing, ensure that building height, color, and materials are compatible with those of the adjacent historic cluster. Maximum building height should be between 25 feet to 35 feet.

Guidelines for Open Space/Vegetation/Views

- Retain and reinforce the historic planting of streetscapes in the East Housing district. Enhance neighborhood character through compatible landscape improvements.
- Protect, restore, enhance, and monitor the Tennessee Hollow watershed by removing fill material and some non-historic housing, daylighting creeks, and restoring native plant communities. Maximize natural processes where feasible.
- Protect wetlands and other natural resources by locating any replacement housing with sufficient offset buffers to minimize impacts and by maintaining appropriate setbacks for a parallel trail system.
- Maintain historic views and view corridors. Manage vegetation on slopes below housing sites, public streets, and trails to maintain views out to the bay while protecting natural resources. Ensure that reforestation maintains views into the historic forest along Presidio Boulevard.

Guidelines for Circulation and Access

- Retain the historic road pattern in the East Housing district. Proposed future changes should use or expand on this pattern and its related system of alleys, parking, and garages.

- Eliminate redundant road segments to limit road crossings of Tennessee Hollow.
- Improve pedestrian connections among housing clusters, and between playing fields and other destinations throughout the Presidio.
- Rehabilitate Lover's Lane as part of the Presidio-wide trail system.

SOUTH HILLS DISTRICT: OUTDOOR RECREATION AND WOODLAND RETREAT

Guideline for Spatial Organization and Land Patterns

- Connect the Presidio's remnant ridgetop open space by restoring and rehabilitating native and forested landscapes and by removing non-historic housing.

Guidelines for Buildings and Structures

- Prohibit new construction in the South Hills, other than small structures to serve the visitor and management needs of the park.
- Locate required small structures (such as visitor bathrooms) to serve park users in a manner compatible in scale, massing, height, material, and color with the natural setting.
- Remove supporting infrastructure, as feasible, as part of building demolition in those areas planned for ecological restoration.

Guidelines for Open Space/Vegetation/Views

- Carry out *Vegetation Management Plan* (VMP) provisions for rehabilitating and restoring the Presidio forest and native plant areas; pursue restoration of native plant communities where housing is removed along West Washington Boulevard.

APPENDIX C
Contributing Features of the NHLD

APPENDIX C

Contributing Features of the NHLD

Building Number	Building Name	Year Built
Crissy Field		
0603	Photo Lab & Library	1939
0631	Ammunition Magazine	1935
0632	Ammunition Magazine	1935
0633	Ammunition Magazine	1935
0635	Battery Blaney	1901
0636	Battery Sherwood	1900
0640	Aircraft Hanger	1928
0641	Latrine	1928
0643	Aircraft Hanger	1923
0650	Stillwell Hall	1921
0651	Administration Building	1921
0652	Transformer Vault	1921
0654	Guard House	1921
0661	Cavalry Stables	1913
0662	Cavalry Stables	1914
0663	Cavalry Stables	1914
0667	Cavalry Stables	1914
0668	Cavalry Stables	1914
0669	Post Incinerator	1936
0670	Cable House	1921
0671	Inflammable Material Storage Shed	1939
0680	Electrical Substation	1908
0681	Day Room	1923
0682	Community Center	1902
0683	Day Room	1923
0920	Parachute Shop	1921
0922	Transformer Vault	1921
0923	Transformer Vault	1921
0926	Aircraft Hanger	1921
0929	Pump House	1921
0931	Inflammable Materials Storage	1921
0933	Aircraft Hanger	1921
0934	Motor Maintenance Building	1921
0935	Aero Maintenance Building	1921
0936	Transformer Vault	1921
0937	Aircraft Hanger	1921
1182	Warehouse	1919
1183	Warehouse	1917
1184	Warehouse	1917

Building Number	Building Name	Year Built
1185	Warehouse	1917
1186	Warehouse	1917
1187	Warehouse	1917
1188	Warehouse	1917
East Housing		
0001	Command. Gen. Qtrs.	1943
0510	Officers Fam. Housing	1940
0511	Officers Fam. Housing	1940
0512	Officers Fam. Housing	1940
0513	Officers Fam. Housing	1940
0514	Officers Fam. Housing	1940
0517	Garage	1942
0530	Officers Fam. Housing	1940
0531	Officers Fam. Housing	1940
0532	Officers Fam. Housing	1940
0533	Officers Fam. Housing	1940
0534	Officers Fam. Housing	1940
0535	Officers Fam. Housing	1940
0536	Officers Fam. Housing	1940
0537	Officers Fam. Housing	1940
0538	Officers Fam. Housing	1940
0539	Officers Fam. Housing	1940
0540	Officers Fam. Housing	1917
0541	Officers Fam. Housing	1917
0542	Officers Fam. Housing	1917
0543	Officers Fam. Housing	1917
0544	Officers Fam. Housing	1917
0545	Officers Fam. Housing	1917
0546	Officers Fam. Housing	1917
0547	Officers Fam. Housing	1917
0548	Officers Fam. Housing	1917
0549	Officers Fam. Housing	1917
0550	Officers Fam. Housing	1917
0551	Officers Fam. Housing	1917
0552	Garage	1939
0553	Garage	1939
0554	Garage	1939
0555	Garage	1939
0556	Garage	1939
0557	Garage	1939

Note: These are contributing buildings only; for a full inventory of contributing features (including roads, landscape features, etc.), please refer to the 1993 NHL Update available at the Trust library.

APPENDIX C

Contributing Features of the NHLD

Building Number	Building Name	Year Built
1216	Enlisted Men's Barracks	1912
1217	Enlisted Men's Barracks	1912
1218	Enlisted Men's Barracks With Mess	1912
1219	Quartermaster's Storehouse	1912
1220	Quartermaster's Office	1918
1221	Post Exchange Gas Station	1945
1221A	Storage Shed	unkn
1224	Fort Winfield Scott Infirmary	1912
1225	Post Exchange Storehouse	1942
1226	Fort Winfield Scott Gymnasium	1911
1227	Quartermaster's Shop	1917
1230	Warehouse	1918
1231	Blacksmith Shop	1913
1233	Post Paint Storehouse	1933
1237	Day Room	1942
1239	Fort Winfield Scott Post Office	1942
1240	Enlisted Family Housing	1918
1241	Warehouse	1941
1242	Warehouse	1941
1243	Warehouse	1941
1245	Inflammable Storage Shed	1918
1246	Detached Garage	1941
1247	Detached Garage	1941
1248	Detached Garage	1941
1250	Detached Garage	1941
1261	Enlisted Family Housing	1909
1262	Enlisted Family Housing	1909
1263	Enlisted Family Housing	1921
1265	Enlisted Family Housing	1909
1266	Enlisted Family Housing	1921
1268	Enlisted Family Housing	1909
1270	Enlisted Family Housing	1921
1272	Enlisted Family Housing	1912
1273	Enlisted Family Housing	1912
1274	Enlisted Family Housing	1912
1275	Enlisted Family Housing	1933
1276	Enlisted Family Housing	1933
1277	Enlisted Family Housing	1933
1283	Fire Control For Battery Wagner	1895
1285	Garage	1933

Building Number	Building Name	Year Built
1287	Battery Howe-Wagner	1895
1289	Enlisted Family Housing	1933
1290	Enlisted Family Housing	1933
1291	Officers' Family Housing	1933
1293	Officers' Family Housing	1933
1294	Enlisted Family Housing	1933
1295	Enlisted Family Housing	1933
1297	Enlisted Family Housing	1933
1298	Enlisted Family Housing	1933
1299	Log Cabin Community Center	1937
1300	Officers' Family Housing	1910
1301	Detached Garage	1940
1302	Officers' Family Housing	1902
1303	Detached Garage	1940
1304	Officers' Family Housing	1902
1305	Garage	1917
1307	Detached Garage	1918
1308	Officers' Family Housing	1910
1309	Garage	1941
1310	Officers' Family Housing	1910
1311	Detached Garage	1920
1313	Detached Garage	1917
1314	Officers' Family Housing	1912
1315	Detached Garage	1915
1317	Detached Garage	1917
1319	Detached Garage	1917
1320	Officers' Family Housing	1910
1321	Detached Garage	1941
1322	Officers' Family Housing	1912
1323	Detached Garage	1919
1324	Officers' Family Housing	1910
1325	Detached Garage	1941
1326	Officers' Family Housing	1910
1327	Detached Garage	1940
1328	Officers' Family Housing	1910
1330	Barnard Hall (Officers' Quarters)	1915
1331	Fort Winfield Scott Recreation Center	1921
1332	Officers' Family Housing	1943
1334	Officers' Family Housing	1912
1335	Detached Garage	1921

Note: These are contributing buildings only; for a full inventory of contributing features (including roads, landscape features, etc.), please refer to the 1993 NHL Update available at the Trust library.

APPENDIX C

Contributing Features of the NHLD

Building Number	Building Name	Year Built
0047	Garage	1940
0048	Garage	1940
0049	Off. Club Admin.	1882
0050	Off. Club	1800
0051	Officers Fam. Housing	1889
0053	H2O Pres. Sta.	1910
0056	Officers Fam. Housing	1885
0057	Officers Fam. Housing	1885
0058	Officers Fam. Housing	1885
0059	Officers Fam. Housing	1885
0064	Officers Fam. Housing	1885
0065	Officers Fam. Housing	1893
0067	Main Telephone Ex.	1919
0086	Enlisted Barracks	1862
0087	Enlisted Barracks	1862
0095	Amm. Magazine	1863
0097	Red Cross	1942
0099	Theater	1939
0100	Mont. St. Barracks	1909
0101	Mont. St. Barracks	1895
0103	Mont. St. Barracks	1895
0104	Mont. St. Barracks	1895
0105	Mont. St. Barracks	1895
0106	Mont. St. Barracks	1909
0107	Switching Sta.	1911
0108	Storage	1940
0113	Garage	1940
0116	Sutler's Store	1885
0118	Garage	1940
0122	Community Center	1904
0123	Garage	1930
0124	Enl. Family Hsg.	1909
0125	Enl. Family Hsg.	1909
0126	Enl. Family Hsg.	1909
0127	Enl. Family Hsg.	1931
0128	Enl. Family Hsg.	1931
0129	Enl. Family Hsg.	1931
0130	Post Chapel	1932
0135	NCO	1949
0201	Exchange Store Admin.	1896

Building Number	Building Name	Year Built
0204	Exchange Store Admin.	1896
0210	Post Office	1900
0218	Fire St.	1917
0220	Garrison Hdqtr.	1939
0222	Warehouse-Office	1910
0223	Warehouse-Office	1897
0224	Flammable Storage	1940
0225	Storehouse	1910
0227	Warehouse	1897
0228	Dry Clean.	1909
0229	Bank Mach.	1897
0230	Warehouse	1917
0325	Officers Fam. Housing	1910
0326	Officers Fam. Housing	1910
0327	Officers Fam. Housing	1910
0328	Officers Fam. Housing	1910
0329	Officers Fam. Housing	1910
0330	Officers Fam. Housing	1910
0331	Officers Fam. Housing	1910
0332	Officers Fam. Housing	1910
0333	Officers Fam. Housing	1910
0334	Officers Fam. Housing	1910
0335	Officers Fam. Housing	1910
0336	Officers Fam. Housing	1910
0337	Officers Fam. Housing	1910
0338	Officers Fam. Housing	1910
0339	Officers Fam. Housing	1910
0340	Officers Fam. Housing	1910
0341	Officers Fam. Housing	1910
0342	Officers Fam. Housing	1910
0343	Officers Fam. Housing	1910
0344	Officers Fam. Housing	1910
0345	Officers Fam. Housing	1910
0375	Detached Garage	1939
0376	Detached Garage	1939
0377	Detached Garage	1939
0378	Detached Garage	1939
0379	Detached Garage	1939
0380	Detached Garage	1939

Note: These are contributing buildings only; for a full inventory of contributing features (including roads, landscape features, etc.), please refer to the 1993 NHL Update available at the Trust library.

APPENDIX D
Final Programmatic Agreement

PROGRAMMATIC AGREEMENT
AMONG THE PRESIDIO TRUST, NATIONAL PARK SERVICE,
THE ADVISORY COUNCIL ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION,
AND THE CALIFORNIA STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICER
REGARDING THE PRESIDIO TRUST IMPLEMENTATION PLAN
AND
VARIOUS OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE ACTIVITIES
FOR AREA "B" OF THE PRESIDIO OF SAN FRANCISCO,
GOLDEN GATE NATIONAL RECREATION AREA

WHEREAS, the Presidio Trust (the Trust), pursuant to the Presidio Trust Act, Title I of Public Law 104-333, was established as a wholly owned government corporation to manage a portion of the Presidio of San Francisco (Presidio); and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Public Law 104-333, administrative jurisdiction was transferred to the Trust on July 1, 1998 for approximately 80 percent of the Presidio that was depicted as Area B on the map entitled "Presidio Trust Number 1," dated December 7, 1995, as such may be amended from time to time; and

WHEREAS, the remaining area of the Presidio was depicted as Area A on said map and administrative jurisdiction for Area A remains with the National Park Service (NPS); and

WHEREAS, the entire Presidio remains a part of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA), is a designated National Historic Landmark District (NHL), is listed on the National Register of Historic Places (NR), contains prehistoric archaeological sites, and historic archaeological resources, buildings, structures, objects, zones, and cultural landscapes representing 218 years of military history; and

WHEREAS, the Trust, in order to meet its Congressionally mandated requirement of preserving the Presidio as a sustainable National Park within the GGNRA by the year 2013, carries out a variety of undertakings, including but not limited to maintenance, rehabilitation, repair, moving, interim and long-term leasing, construction and demolition of buildings, structures, and roads, and work regarding grounds and associated landscaping within Area "B" of the Presidio; and

WHEREAS, the Trust has determined that these undertakings may have an effect upon properties included in or eligible for the NR, including properties that contribute to the NHL and has notified the Secretary of the Interior in accordance with 36 CFR 800.10(c); and

WHEREAS, the Trust has consulted with the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP), and the California State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) and NPS; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to 36 CFR 800.14 (b)(2), which implements Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), the entities listed above have been invited to sign this Programmatic Agreement (PA); and

WHEREAS, the Trust has identified the National Trust for Historic Preservation and the Fort Point and Presidio Historical Association as consulting parties and has invited them to concur in this PA; and

WHEREAS, the Trust has made a good faith effort to locate federally recognized Indian tribes that may attach religious and cultural significance to properties under the administrative jurisdiction of the Trust or with which the Trust could consult under the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA); and the Trust has determined that there are no such federally recognized tribes; and

WHEREAS, ACHP regulations encourage federal agencies to use to the extent possible existing agency procedures and mechanisms (including mechanisms under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)) to fulfill their consultation requirements; and

Standards and Guidelines for Federal Agency Historic Preservation Programs Pursuant to the National Historic Preservation Act.”

B. All work pursuant to this PA regarding historic buildings and structures will be reviewed by, or under the supervision of, a person having five years or more experience in historic preservation and meeting the professional qualifications for Historian, Architectural Historian or Historic Architect included in “The Secretary of the Interior’s Historic Preservation Professional Qualification Standards.”

C. All work pursuant to this PA regarding archaeological resources will be carried out by or under the supervision of a Registered Professional Archaeologist having five years or more experience in prehistoric or historic archaeology and meeting the professional qualifications for Archaeologist included in “Archaeology and Historic Preservation, Secretary of the Interior’s Standards and Guidelines.”

D. All analyses to determine if an undertaking falls under Appendix A and therefore requires no further review will be carried out by persons who meet the standards set forth above in this Stipulation III. All such persons are deemed for purposes of this PA as “qualified personnel” under the standards and guidelines cited above.

IV. PERSONNEL TRAINING

A. The Trust shall continue to provide appropriate training to personnel involved in the maintenance, repair, and rehabilitation of historic buildings, structures, and housing units, and for all personnel responsible for making decisions regarding maintenance, repair, and rehabilitation. The Trust shall utilize specialized crafts training programs in practical application of “The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties.” In addition, the Trust will provide training in conservation technology as applied to historic structures and archaeological sites.

B. The Trust shall develop and implement an in-house training program to advise Trust personnel of this PA and procedures, techniques, and related matters regarding the preservation of the historic properties located within Area B. The scope of training and the schedule for its implementation will be submitted as part of the annual report to all parties in accordance with Stipulation XXI. below.

V. AREA OF POTENTIAL EFFECTS

The Trust will delineate the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for all proposed operations and maintenance undertakings covered by the PA. For all other proposed undertakings, the Trust shall consult with SHPO to delineate the APE.

VI. IDENTIFICATION OF HISTORIC PROPERTIES

A. Numerous surveys and evaluations have been conducted to identify NR eligible and NHL/D contributing properties for the entire Presidio landmark district, regardless of administrative jurisdiction, including the 1993 NHL/D update. As necessary to implement this PA, the Trust will determine if there are additional properties in Area B not previously listed or determined eligible for listing on the NR or as contributors to the NHL/D. Evaluation of buildings or structures which may become 50 years old or may have achieved exceptional significance while this PA is in effect shall be conducted within the framework of the “Statewide Historic Buildings and Structures Inventory, Department of Defense Installations, State of California, Volumes 1-3” and the “National Register of Historic Places Registration Forms for the Presidio of San Francisco National Historic Landmark District” (1993).

B. If a property in Area B that was not previously listed or determined eligible for listing on the NR is determined by the Trust to be eligible, the Trust shall treat that property as eligible for purposes of this PA. Such determination requires no SHPO review. Any such determinations will be documented in accordance with Stipulation XXI. below.

f. No Historic Properties Affected or No Adverse Effect. If the above process results in the FPO's finding that no historic properties are affected by the proposed undertaking or that the proposal will have no adverse effect on historic properties, the FPO will document that finding in the undertaking's administrative record, insure that the finding is included within the report required by Stipulation XXI, and make the finding available upon request to any party or the public. Absent objection by any party or member of the public who has requested a copy of the findings, the undertaking may proceed without further review by the ACHP, SHPO, or NPS. The Trust will address objections made pursuant to this paragraph in accordance with Stipulation XVIII.

g. Adverse Effect.

i. If the FPO finds a proposed undertaking will result in an adverse effect, the Trust may consult with the NPS to determine if the adverse effect may be avoided. Where the Trust and NPS agree on how to avoid such adverse effect, they shall document their agreement and such agreement shall be included by the FPO in the report pursuant to Stipulation XXI. Implementation of the undertaking in accordance with the documented agreement shall be deemed to be resolution of the adverse effect.

ii. If the FPO finds the proposed undertaking will result in an adverse effect and consults with NPS but fails to reach agreement, or if the FPO chooses not to consult with NPS pursuant to paragraph VII.B.2.g.i. above, then the FPO shall consult with ACHP, SHPO and the concurring parties to resolve the adverse effect in accordance with 36 CFR 800.6.

3. Undertakings belonging to category A.3. shall be reviewed pursuant to Stipulations IX., X., and XI. below.

4. Undertakings belonging to category A. 4. shall be reviewed pursuant to Stipulations IX. B. and IX. C.

C. Modification of a Reviewed Project. If after completion of an undertaking's review pursuant to this stipulation or if during the implementation of any previously reviewed project pursuant to this stipulation, the Trust finds it necessary to modify the project scope or construction documents, the FPO or a designated qualified person under Stipulation III. shall review the proposed modification under the process contained in Stipulation VII. B. above.

VIII. SALVAGE AND SUSTAINABILITY

If an historic property will be demolished, the Trust's qualified personnel will conduct a documented inspection to identify architectural elements and objects that may be reused in rehabilitating similar historic structures, or that may be preserved in a museum archival collection.

IX. PRESIDIO TRUST IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

The Presidio Trust Implementation Plan (PTIP) is a programmatic document that presents a range of preferred land uses, PTIP Planning Principles (Principles) and Planning District Guidelines (PDG) for designated planning districts within Area B of the Presidio. The Principles and PDG conform to "The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic Buildings" (1995) (Standards). Intended as a policy framework to guide the Trust's future activities, the PTIP does not specify treatments for individual buildings, or identify specific areas for new construction. Instead, the PTIP envisions further project-specific and/or district-level planning prior to building demolition or new construction with the potential to adversely affect historic properties. Undertakings proposed under the PTIP other than those discussed below in Paragraphs A., B., or C. will be subject to consultation pursuant to Stipulation VII. For the undertakings proposed under the PTIP and discussed below, Section 106 compliance shall be achieved as follows:

time frame for this consultation shall not exceed 30 calendar days from the date of the Trust's written notification. If the issues pertaining to the Trust's decision are partially or fully resolved or a consensus is reached within this time frame, then the FDD shall be modified, if necessary, by the Trust in accordance with the resolution. Thereupon, the Trust may proceed in accordance with Paragraphs C. or D. of this stipulation, as applicable. If the issues pertaining to the Trust's decision are not fully resolved or a consensus is not reached within this time frame, the Trust will forward all documentation relevant to the dispute to the ACHP for response within 30 calendar days in accordance with Stipulation XVIII. below governing the resolution of objections.

F. Failure of NPS, SHPO, ACHP, or the concurring parties to comment within the time frames established by this stipulation or within timeframes otherwise agreed to by those parties on any document submitted for review pursuant to this stipulation will be deemed a waiver of the opportunity to comment, and the Trust may proceed without considering the comment(s) that might otherwise have been made. However, the Trust shall consider the reasonable written request of any signatory party for a modification of the timeframes established by this Stipulation.

XI. REVIEW OF NEW CONSTRUCTION FOLLOWING FUTURE PLANNING

A. Where new construction is proposed under planning documents developed pursuant to Stipulation X. above, the Trust will ensure that all design and construction documents conform to the contents of applicable planning documents, and that identified measures to address adverse effects are included in the design and construction documents and committed to as part of the project implementation.

B. The Trust's determination that design and construction documents conform to the planning documents reviewed in accordance with Stipulation X. above shall be documented in the project's administrative record and in the report developed in accordance with Stipulation XXI. Where changes to the project are required to ensure conformity, these changes shall also be documented in writing.

XII. ARCHAEOLOGY

A. The treatment of archaeological properties shall be handled in accordance with the terms of an Archaeological Management Assessment and Monitoring Program (AMA/MP) that is prepared for individual undertakings or groups of related undertakings. This will ensure that all planned undertakings will be reviewed by a qualified archaeologist prior to final design and/or approval. In addition to the AMA/MP, an archaeological research design will be prepared for any archaeological investigations that include testing for NR eligibility or test excavations or data recovery from prehistoric or historic sites that are known to be NR eligible or are listed as contributors to the NHL. The Trust's management of archaeological properties will be reviewed annually in accordance with Stipulation XXI.

B. Ground disturbing maintenance activities and construction projects will be closely observed in the vicinity of sensitive archaeological areas to discover, document, protect, and manage the archaeological record of the Presidio. During the planning process for such projects, an AMA/MP shall be prepared to determine whether archival research, subsurface coring or trenching, and/or test excavations are required prior to ground disturbance. Archaeological monitoring is appropriate in areas of predicted archaeological sensitivity or for sampling purposes in areas that are not considered sensitive when the natural ground surface is obscured by paving or fill, or in other instances where a pedestrian survey or archaeological testing cannot reasonably be accomplished. Any required archaeological monitoring shall be implemented in accordance with an AMA/MP prepared by qualified personnel. If historic properties are discovered during implementation of an undertaking, a detailed report shall be prepared. Large-scale ground disturbing activities shall be monitored in accordance with an AMA/MP. Should circumstances arise where the Trust cannot address archaeological concerns in a manner consistent with the AMA/MP, the Trust shall notify the SHPO.

C. The Trust anticipates that previously unidentified subsurface historic properties may be encountered within the NHL boundary due to the placement of fill over some of the historic marsh areas, historic

C. If a Trust tenant is denied Part II Certification or is unable to meet conditions for such certification, the provisions of Stipulation VII. shall apply.

XV. PERMITS, LEASES AND OTHER AGREEMENTS

Undertakings may also be permits, leases, or other agreements issued by the Trust and shall be subject to the same review as other Trust undertakings. The Trust shall provide for identification and treatment of historic properties in a manner that meets guidelines and standards set forth in the stipulations of this PA.

XVI. EMERGENCY ACTIONS

A. In the event that an emergency occurs at the Presidio that affects historic properties, the Trust may take actions without consultation to stabilize any involved historic properties and prevent further damage within 30 days from the termination of the emergency or longer with approval of the signatory parties. Where possible, such emergency measures will be undertaken in a manner that does not foreclose future preservation or restoration, with on-site monitoring by qualified personnel, and advance telephonic notification of NPS and SHPO.

B. Emergency response work will be conducted in a manner to avoid or minimize effects on historic properties. Should historic properties be discovered during emergency repair or response activity, work in the immediate area of the property will cease if the Trust determines that a work stoppage at the site will not impede emergency response activities. The Trust will advise NPS and SHPO by telephone of the emergency, the steps being taken to address the emergency, the discovered property and its apparent significance, and a description of the emergency work and potential effects on the discovered property.

C. Within 30 days following this notification, the Trust will provide the SHPO with a written report documenting the actions taken to minimize effects, the work's present status, the planned treatment of the property, and the condition of any other properties encountered as post-review discoveries. This action will be noted in the report developed in accordance with Stipulation XXI. below.

XVII. NATURAL DISASTERS

A. In the event of a natural disaster, the Trust shall undertake emergency actions consistent with the principles underlying this PA to stabilize historic properties and prevent further damage without SHPO consultation. Where possible, such emergency measures will be undertaken in a manner that does not foreclose future preservation or restoration. The Trust will immediately notify NPS and within 5 days of when telephone communications are re-established consult with SHPO on all emergency measures taken that impacted on or will impact on historic properties. Permanent repairs to historic properties beyond the scope of emergency repairs are not authorized by this stipulation.

B. This stipulation does not apply to undertakings that will be implemented more than 30 days after the disaster terminates. Such undertakings shall be reviewed in accordance with 36 CFR Part 800 unless they are covered by other stipulations in this PA.

XVIII. RESOLVING OBJECTIONS

A. Should any signatory party or concurring party object in writing to the Trust regarding the manner in which the terms of this PA are carried out, to any action carried out or proposed with respect to the implementation of this PA, or to any documentation prepared in accordance with and subject to the terms of this PA, the Trust shall consult with the objecting party to resolve this objection. If after initiating such consultation the Trust determines that the objection cannot be resolved within 15 days through such consultation, the Trust shall forward all documentation relevant to the objection to the ACHP including the Trust's proposed response to the objection. Within 15 calendar days after receipt of all pertinent documentation the ACHP shall exercise one of the following options:

1. A list of all undertakings reviewed under Stipulation VII. and a summary of Tax Credit projects as described in Stipulation XIV. above.

2. Efforts to identify and/or evaluate potential historic properties, monitoring efforts, archaeological management assessments or research designs, and treatment of historic properties.

3. Reports of any training given pursuant to Stipulation IV. above, identification of current Trust points of contact, and notification of any historic preservation personnel changes.

4. Any recommendations to amend this PA or improve communications among the parties.

B. The activities listed in Appendix A shall be reviewed as part of the Report at which time the signatory parties may modify the list by adding new activities or removing other activities without requiring amendment of the PA. Should the SHPO or ACHP object in writing to the Trust regarding the Report, the objection will be resolved pursuant to Stipulation XVIII.

C. The SHPO and ACHP may monitor activities carried out pursuant to this PA, and the ACHP will review such activities if it deems necessary or is so requested. The Trust shall cooperate with the SHPO and the ACHP in carrying out their monitoring and review responsibilities.

XXII. EFFECT OF THE PASSAGE OF TIME

In any case where a party fails to comment or act within a time frame that is specified or is otherwise agreed upon by the parties, the Trust may thereafter immediately proceed in the matter at issue without further regard to comments or actions by that party.

XXIII. DURATION

This PA shall become effective upon execution by the Trust, the SHPO, and the ACHP and shall remain in effect until 2013, or unless terminated prior to that time in accordance with Stipulation XIX., or unless it is extended for an additional period of time by mutual written agreement of the signatory parties.

XXIV. EXECUTION AND IMPLEMENTATION

Execution and implementation of this Programmatic Agreement evidences that the Trust has satisfied its Section 106 and Section 110(f) responsibilities for all undertakings covered by this PA, including, but not limited to: PTPP, maintenance, rehabilitation, repair, moving, construction and deconstruction of buildings, structures and roads, and work regarding grounds and associated landscaping within the area of responsibility of the Trust. Execution and implementation of this PA also evidences that the Trust has afforded the ACHP a reasonable opportunity to comment on the undertakings and their effects on historic properties and that the Trust has taken into account the effects of the undertakings on historic properties.

SIGNATORY PARTIES:

THE PRESIDIO TRUST

ADVISORY COUNCIL ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION

BY: _____

BY: _____

TITLE: _____

TITLE: _____

APPENDIX A - REPETITIVE OR LOW IMPACT ACTIVITIES

The following classes of undertakings are exempt from further review or consultation under the terms of this PA.

1. Maintenance of contributing buildings which includes:

Housekeeping, routine maintenance, building monitoring, and other such actions (such as repair/replacement of light switches, and rewiring existing fixtures in existing conduit, replacement of window putty) that do not damage historic fabric.

2. Maintenance operations for non-contributing buildings in an historic district, except excavations and borings in archaeologically sensitive areas.

3. Painting of non-historic structures (exterior) to match existing color.

4. Roofing maintenance or replacement on non-historic structures.

5. Regrading of terrain adjacent to a building to achieve positive water runoff in areas not designated as archaeologically sensitive or having vegetation which contributes to the cultural landscape.

6. Routine grounds maintenance such as grass cutting and treatment, maintenance of shrubs, and tree trimming provided these activities are consistent with the Vegetation Management Plan and preservation of the cultural landscape.

7. Maintenance of existing roads or existing parking areas, including repaving and grading, within previously disturbed areas.

8. Rehabilitation, maintenance, or replacement of above-ground utility lines or transmission lines, unless such activities have potential for ground disturbance.

9. Health and safety activities such as non-destructive testing for radon gas, asbestos, lead-based paint, lead pipes, and hazardous materials and wastes.

10. Conducting non-ground disturbing elements of the applicable Integrated Pest Management program for control of pests such as termites, insects, and rodents.

11. Maintenance of existing facilities that does not involve new or additional ground disturbance (e.g., maintenance or replacement of guard rails, barriers, traffic control devices, light fixtures, non-historic curbs and sidewalks).

12. Maintenance (that does not change the configuration or appearance of the existing facilities) of existing electronic communication sites involving no ground disturbance.

This appendix may be revised with the written agreement of ACHP, SHPO, NPS, and the Trust without a revision being made to the underlying PA. Any such change will be documented in the Report described in Stipulation XXI. above.

APPENDIX E
Socioeconomic/Housing Supply

APPENDIX E

Socioeconomic/Housing Supply

**Socioeconomic/Housing Supply Appendix Table 1: No Action
(GMPA 2000) Employment Generation**

Land Use	Employment Density (sf/employee) (a)	No Action (GMPA 2000) Total Employment (b)
Office	350	4,735
Retail	500	310
Industrial/Warehouse	3,500	142
Infrastructure	4,000	21
Lodging	840	431
Conference	840	209
Cultural/Educational	1,200	481
Military	0	0
Recreational	850	130
Total		6,459
Existing Employment (2000) (c)		2,020
New No Action (GMPA 2000) Employment		4,439

Sources: The Presidio Trust; Sedway Group; Bay Area Economics, 2002.

Notes:

- (a) Employee Densities from Presidio Trust Housing Model, 2001.
- (b) Based on square footages in Housing Appendix Table 2: Employment Generating Land Uses
- (c) Based on current leasing information from Presidio Trust.
- (d) Numbers may not sum due to rounding.

APPENDIX E

Socioeconomic/Housing Supply

Socioeconomic/Housing Supply Appendix Table 3: Employment Generation Analysis – Comparison to No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000)

Land Use	Employment Density (sf/employee) (a)	Number of Employees					
		Final Plan	Final Plan Variant	Resource Consolidation	Sustainable(b) Community	Cultural Destination	Minimum Management
Retail	500	5,426	5,426	6,969	5,658	5,846	6895
Industrial/Warehouse	3,500	372	182	377	529	407	515
Infrastructure	4,000	47	29	37	23	38	133
Lodging	840	19	24	13	13	13	15
Conference	840	252	152	208	208	407	0
Cultural/Educational	840	59	76	185	141	130	29
Military	1,200	768	546	576	703	796	116
Recreational	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Parking Structure	850	181	190	136	246	202	121
Residential	10,000	0	0	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Employment (2020)		6,886	6,626	8,480	7,521	7,840	7,823
Existing Employment (2000) (c)		2,020	2,020	2,020	2,020	2,020	2,020
New Employment (2020-2000) (Total Employment Less Existing Employment)		4,866	4,606	6,460	5,501	5,820	5,803
New No Action (GMPA 2000) Employment (d)		4,439	4,439	4,439	4,439	4,439	4,439
New Project Employment (e) (New Employment Less New No Action/GMPA 2000 Employment)		428	167	2,021	1,062	1,381	1,364

Sources: The Presidio Trust; Sedway Group; Bay Area Economics, 2002.

Notes:

- (a) Employee Densities from Sedway Group, 2001.
- (b) Employment equals Square Footage by Land Use (From Housing Appendix Table 2: Employment Generating Land Uses) divided by Employment Density.
- (c) Existing Employment data are based on current Presidio leasing information, and do not use Employee Densities as a multiplication factor. Sedway Group, 2001.
- (d) From Housing Appendix Table 1: No Action (GMPA 2000) Employment Generation. Represents the change between 2000 employment and total No Action (GMPA 2000) employment in 2020.
- (e) Numbers may not sum due to rounding.

APPENDIX E

Socioeconomic/Housing Supply

Socioeconomic/Housing Supply Appendix Table 5: Distribution of Housing Impact – Comparison with No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000)

		Final Plan		Final Plan Variant		Resource Consolidation		Sustainable Community		Cultural Destination		Minimum Management	
Additional Household Demand in the HIA(a)		(516)		(358)		929		(3)		(42)		262	
	% of All Commuters to Richmond Super-district (b)	Final Plan Number	% of New HH In Super-district (c)	Final Plan Variant Number	% of New HH In Super-district (c)	Resource Consolidation Number	% of New HH In Super-district (c)	Sustainable Community Number	% of New HH In Super-district (c)	Cultural Destination Number	% of New HH In Super-district (c)	Minimum Management Number	% of New HH In Super-district (c)
Superdistricts In HIA													
Downtown SF	5.4%	(28)	-0.5%	(19)	-0.4%	50	0.9%	(0)	0.0%	(2)	0.0%	14	0.1%
Richmond District	31.7%	(164)	-6.3%	(114)	-4.3%	294	11.2%	(1)	0.0%	(13)	-0.5%	83	1.0%
Mission District	15.4%	(79)	-1.1%	(55)	-0.8%	143	2.0%	(0)	0.0%	(7)	-0.1%	40	0.2%
Sunset District	7.9%	(41)	-4.6%	(28)	-3.2%	73	8.3%	(0)	0.0%	(3)	-0.4%	21	0.7%
Daly City/San Bruno	8.1%	(42)	-0.5%	(29)	-0.4%	75	0.9%	(0)	0.0%	(3)	0.0%	21	0.1%
San Mateo/Burlingame	2.2%	(11)	-0.1%	(8)	-0.1%	20	0.2%	(0)	0.0%	(1)	0.0%	6	0.0%
Hayward/San Leandro	1.5%	(7)	-0.1%	(5)	0.0%	13	0.1%	(0)	0.0%	(1)	0.0%	4	0.0%
Oakland/Alameda	4.4%	(23)	-0.4%	(16)	-0.3%	41	0.7%	(0)	0.0%	(2)	0.0%	12	0.1%
Berkeley/Albany	1.4%	(7)	-0.2%	(5)	-0.0%	13	0.4%	(0)	0.0%	(1)	0.0%	4	0.0%
Richmond/El Cerrito	2.3%	(12)	-0.1%	(8)	-0.1%	22	0.2%	(0)	0.0%	(1)	0.0%	6	0.0%
Concord/Martinez	1.6%	(8)	-0.1%	(6)	0.0%	15	0.1%	(0)	0.0%	(1)	0.0%	4	0.0%
Vallejo/Benicia	1.2%	(6)	-0.1%	(4)	0.0%	11	0.1%	(0)	0.0%	(0)	0.0%	3	0.0%
Fairfield/Vacaville	1.2%	(6)	0.0%	(4)	0.0%	11	0.0%	(0)	0.0%	(1)	0.0%	3	0.0%
Novato	0.7%	(3)	-0.1%	(2)	-0.1%	6	0.2%	(0)	0.0%	(0)	0.0%	2	0.0%
San Rafael	2.3%	(12)	-0.2%	(8)	-0.2%	21	0.4%	(0)	0.0%	(1)	0.0%	6	0.0%
Mill Valley/Sausalito	3.2%	(16)	-0.6%	(11)	-0.4%	29	1.08%	(0)	0.0%	(1)	0.0%	8	0.1%
Total (c)	90.3%	(466)		(324)		839		(3)		(38)		236	
Remaining Households Residing Outside the HIA	9.7%	(50)		(35)		90		(0)		(4)		25	

Sources: The Presidio Trust; Metropolitan Transportation Commission, Commuter Forecasts for the San Francisco Bay Area, 1990-2020; Metropolitan Transportation Commission, Superdistrict and County Summaries of ABAG Projections, 2000; Bay Area Economics, 2002.

Notes:

- (a) From Table 41a, Section 4.4.4 in the Final EIS Volume I: Presidio Housing Impact Analysis.
- (b) From Table 16, Section 3.4.2 in the Final EIS Volume I: Definition of Housing Impact Area.
- (c) Between 2000 and 2020.

APPENDIX E

Socioeconomic/Housing Supply

Socioeconomic/Housing Supply Appendix Table 7: Presidio Housing Impact - Comparison with 2000

Alternative	New Employment (a)	New Household Demand (b)	Net New Supply (c)	Additional Household Demand in HIA (d)
No Action (GMPA 2000)	4,439	2,840	(611)	3,451
Final Plan	4,866	3,114	179	2,935
Final Plan Variant	4,606	2,947	(146)	3,093
Resource Consolidation	6,460	4,133	(247)	4,380
Sustainable Community	5,501	3,520	72	3,448
Cultural Destination	5,820	3,724	315	3,409
Minimum Management	5,803	3,713	0	3,713

Sources: The Presidio Trust; Metropolitan Transportation Commission, Superdistrict and County Summaries of ABAG Projections, 2000; Bay Area Economics, 2002.

Notes:

- (a) From Housing Appendix Table 3: Employment Generation Analysis.
 - (b) New Household Demand equals New Employment divided by Employed Residents per Household for the Bay Area in 2020: 1.563
 - (c) From Housing Appendix Table 6: Projected Presidio Single-Family and Multifamily Housing Supply - Comparison to 2000.
 - (d) Additional Household Demand in HIA equals New Household Demand minus Net New Supply.
- HIA = Housing Impact Area, as defined by Affected Environment Table 16: Definition of Housing Impact Area.

APPENDIX E

Socioeconomic/Housing Supply

Socioeconomic/Housing Supply Appendix Table 9: Total Housing Demand Analysis

Alternative	Total Employment (a)	Total Housing Demand (b)
No Action (GMPA 2000)	6,459	4,132
Final Plan	6,886	4,406
Final Plan Variant	6,626	4,239
Resource Consolidation	8,480	5,425
Sustainable Community	7,521	4,812
Cultural Destination	7,840	5,016
Minimum Management	7,823	5,005

Sources: ABAG Projections 2000; The Presidio Trust; Bay Area Economics, 2001.

Notes:

- (a) From Housing Appendix Table 3: Employment Generation Analysis.
- (b) Total Household Demand equals Total Employment divided by Employed Residents per Household for the Bay Area in 2020 (1.563).

APPENDIX F
Schools

APPENDIX F

Schools

Schools Appendix Table 1: PTMP Public School Enrollment Estimates Data Sources (a, b, c, d)

San Francisco Population Age 5-17							
Age	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000
5	7,070	7,480	7,750	7,600	7,210	6,890	6,710
6	6,630	6,800	7,240	7,420	7,240	6,910	6,630
7	6,280	6,490	6,710	7,050	7,190	7,040	6,760
8	5,930	5,940	6,180	6,300	6,590	6,780	6,640
9	6,490	6,500	6,560	6,750	6,830	7,150	7,340
10	6,580	6,730	6,790	6,750	6,900	7,000	7,300
11	6,880	6,740	6,950	6,910	6,820	7,050	7,130
12	6,840	6,840	6,760	6,870	6,770	6,730	6,940
13	6,810	6,990	7,040	6,860	6,920	6,900	6,870
14	6,640	6,750	6,990	6,940	6,710	6,840	6,840
15	6,560	6,920	7,100	7,240	7,130	6,840	6,990
16	6,520	6,770	7,200	7,270	7,340	7,340	7,060
17	6,820	6,810	7,130	7,620	7,860	7,740	7,750
Total 5-17	86,050	87,760	90,400	91,580	91,510	91,210	90,960
Total Population	729,140	730,660	735,310	740,620	745,780	745,510	744,570
Total All Ages	729,140	730,660	735,310	740,620	745,780	745,510	744,570
% 5 - 10	5.3%	5.5%	5.6%	5.7%	5.6%	5.6%	5.6%
% 11 - 13	2.8%	2.8%	2.8%	2.8%	2.8%	2.8%	2.8%
% 14 - 17	3.6%	3.7%	3.9%	3.9%	3.9%	3.9%	3.8%
San Francisco Unified School District Enrollment (e)							
Grade	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000
K-12	62,579	62,293	62,830	62,149	61,950	62,101	62,041
Percent of San Francisco Children Age 5-17 Enrolled in SFUSD (f)							
Grade	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000
K-12	72.7%	71.0%	69.5%	67.9%	67.7%	68.1%	68.2%

Source: Bay Area Economics, 2001.

Notes:

- (a) 1994-2000 Average San Francisco Population Age 5-10: 5.6%
- (b) 1994-2000 Average San Francisco Population Age 11-13: 2.8%
- (c) 1994-2000 Average San Francisco Population Age 14-17: 3.8%
- (d) Source: Woods & Poole Economics, Inc.
- (e) Source: California Department of Education, Education Demographics Unit.
- (f) Average SFUSD Enrollment 1994-2000 For SF Population Age 5-17: 69.3%

APPENDIX G
Transportation

APPENDIX G

Transportation

Transportation Appendix Table 1: Weekday AM Peak Hour Person Trips by Mode by Planning District

	No Action (GMPA 2000)	Final Plan	Final Plan Variant	Resource Consolidation	Sustainable Community	Cultural Destination	Minimum Management
Main Post, Crissy Field, Cavalry Stables							
Auto Person Trips	1,889	2,020	1,566	2,288	2,587	2,351	2,867
Inbound	1,403	1,522	1,200	1,777	1,909	1,794	1,991
Outbound	486	498	366	510	678	557	877
Transit Person Trips	479	669	536	763	824	784	545
Inbound	361	512	415	597	620	602	393
Outbound	118	156	121	166	205	182	152
Bike/Ped/Other Person Trips	438	584	452	637	713	694	528
Inbound	319	439	342	486	520	522	368
Outbound	120	145	110	151	192	173	160
Total Person Trips	2,807	3,273	2,553	3,687	4,123	3,829	3,940
Inbound	2,083	2,474	1,957	2,861	3,049	2,917	2,752
Outbound	724	799	596	826	1,074	911	1,188
Total Vehicle Trips	1,593	1,614	1,295	1,907	2,089	1,926	2,403
Inbound	1,215	1,239	1,014	1,512	1,578	1,500	1,727
Outbound	378	376	281	395	510	426	676
Letterman							
Auto Person Trips	1,398	1,700	1,620	2,184	1,754	1,876	1,560
Inbound	1,166	1,290	1,308	1,759	1,340	1,353	1,293
Outbound	231	411	312	425	414	523	267
Transit Person Trips	343	473	448	658	484	538	364
Inbound	285	351	361	531	366	374	301
Outbound	58	122	87	127	118	164	63
Bike/Ped/Other Person Trips	334	464	427	596	471	525	353
Inbound	276	343	341	474	352	364	291
Outbound	58	121	86	122	119	161	62
Total Person Trips	2,075	2,637	2,495	3,438	2,709	2,939	2,277
Inbound	1,727	1,984	2,010	2,763	2,058	2,091	1,885
Outbound	348	653	485	674	651	848	392
Total Vehicle Trips	1,090	1,295	1,262	1,773	1,339	1,440	1,243
Inbound	912	986	1,027	1,444	1,030	1,040	1,034
Outbound	178	309	235	330	309	399	209
Fort Scott							
Auto Person Trips	357	527	633	561	549	534	486
Inbound	235	309	444	374	383	318	265